



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/480,701	01/07/2000	MAKOTO KOBAYASHI	12989-JA998	4634

7590 09/15/2003

RICHARD L CATANIA ESQ
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/480,701

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Bunjoo Jaroenchonwanit

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) g.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code 102(e) and 103 (a) not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anupam et al (US. 6,411,989).
3. As to claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11 Anupam discloses a method and apparatus (hereafter a system) for sharing Web-top, i.e., shared web-page, browser, having a manager and a controller for controlling browser in each of collaboration nodes, i.e., node manager, and each of the nodes includes a surrogate, i.e., PageManager, for controlling, detecting changes of a shared web page, sending the change to the controller(s) and/or receiving the changes from the controller. Furthermore, Anupam discloses the surrogate is capable of detecting changes, e.g., user interaction or URL changes, in the shared web page, communicating the changed between the surrogate and the controller, i.e., sending/receiving changes between PageManager and NodeManager (abstract fig. 2; Col. 3, line 40-Col. 4, line 18). Such teaching infers that the means for detecting change and means for receiving changes are inherent; and wherein the PageManager is embedded in each of said browser (browser 151 embedded with surrogate 153, browser 171 embedded with surrogate 173, fig 1).

Art Unit: 2143

4. As to claim 2, Anupam discloses a server 100 includes manager for control session between collaborative browsers, controlling list of document to be reviewed by the perspective collaborator, and displaying pages previously created to the new participant, visiting the sequence URL to review its history, (Col. 3, lines 24-40; Col. 4, lines 33-67) e.g., computer U-N. Such teaching infers that the page and changed pages are stored, e.g., cache in the server for later presentation. Further, Anupam discloses the system using JAVA applet to create a surrogate in each browser, i.e., the server embedding PageManager for controlling pages in each page.

5. As to claim 5, Anupam discloses the surrogate periodically check the document structure changes (Col. 5, lines 19-34; Col. 6, lines 8-40).

6. As to claim 6, Anupam discloses the manager-controller located in the server (fig 2), i.e., independently form browsers, does not migrate, control communication including dynamically generate and terminate session.

7. As to claim 7, Anupam discloses the manager created lists of on going session, which previously created by computer U-1, to be displayed or reviewed in a new participant computer U-N, i.e., transition history of a page (Col. 3, lines 24-40; Col. 4, lines 33-53).

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam et al (US. 6,411,989).

Art Unit: 2143

9. Anupam discloses the invention substantially, as claimed, as described in claim 1, including a PageManager is embedded as Java applets which have an identical domain and data communication by shared memory is performed between said PageManager and said NodeManager, e.g., a surrogate is a JAVA applet created for communicating with the controller in the same domain. Anupam does not express that NodeManager is an embedded JAVA applet embedded. Official Notice is taken (see MPEP 2144.03) JAVA applet and its advantage were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention was made. The JAVA has been widely used in the art for simplifying software integration across platform independent. Thus, taking JAVA advantage by using the JAVA to create an applet or servlet to perform service routines, e.g., a manager-controller, as suggested in Anupam would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made. Because creating the manager-controller by JAVA applet, one ordinary skill in the art could enhance system flexibility and efficiency with minimum complexity, designing time and cost, regardless of types of operating system and computer platform.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remark applicant argued in substance that the prior art does not teach the principal of using the server to embed the PageManager in the page. Examiner disagreed, Anupam taught the concept of sharing web-top, e.g., browser and PageManager, e.g., Surrogate, as discussed in the previous action and above claims' rejection. Previously, the examiner made equivalent between the claimed PageManager and the taught Surrogate (see paragraph 3 above).

Art Unit: 2143

Applicant presented no argument to the equivalency. Further, Anupam also taught each browser is embedded with the Surrogate, as amended.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit whose telephone number is (703) 305-9673. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

/bj
September 10, 2003


BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER